Educational Leadership Measurement Tools Workgroup

Educator Effectiveness Project
Utah Law and Justice Center
MINUTES
January 12, 2012: Meeting #4

Present: Ann Anderson, Sol V. Garcia, Jay Blain, Scott Bushnell, Kim Baker, Jane Ann Bitton, Vicci Gappmayer, Richard Holmes, Suzanne Cottrell, Brian Dawes, Stephen Dimond, Lee Gagon, Patrick Garcia, Barry Graff, Steve Laing, Andrea Rorror, Morgan Murdock, Kerrie Naylor,

Excused: Dixie Allen, Bob Gentry, Betty Barnum, Greg Proffit, Mike Smith Ken Rowley, Tod Johnson, Jeannie Rowland

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kerrie (9:00)

- Roll, travel vouchers, etc.
- Review Minutes from Dec. 9, 2011 Meeting #3
- Review Agenda
- Goals for Today

Explore common educational leadership evaluation system components and analyze other state models in order to become familiar with 1) types of tools for measuring high quality instructional leadership, 2) possibilities for timelines, evaluation steps, and evaluation responsibilities, and 3) formative processes associated with professional growth, goal setting, and self-assessment options.

The minutes were moved and seconded by Kim Baker and Barry Graff. Minutes were approved. The agenda and goals were reviewed.

2. Review Design Criteria from December 9

Suzanne (9:15)

Suzanne reviewed the design criteria with the group. It was noted that some of the criteria might be combined because they are closely related. This will be decided at a future meeting.

- 3. Review Common Elements of State Educational Leadership Evaluation Systems (PPT) Kerrie (9:30)
 - Note differences in State Systems
 - Standards-based Performance Evaluation vs. other models
 - Key Components tied to Standards models (Delaware)

Kerrie presented information about the common elements of other states' leader evaluation systems. Information about differences was also discussed. <u>The PPT is attached to the minutes and will be on</u> the Educator Effectiveness website.

4. Observation Tools – Article

Suzanne (10:00)

- What would observations of administrators look like?
- How does observation fit into an evaluation system for administrators?

Suzanne discussed with the group how observation tools might be included in a leader evaluation system. Observation tools measure leader effectiveness on a variety of standards. Most leader evaluation systems do not include direct observation as a means to measure effectiveness. The group was also given an article to read that supports the use of observation and the venues that may be utilized to measure indicators of behaviors and actions in the standards. The PPT is attached to the minutes.

5. Team Work Kerrie (10:45)

- Review, analyze, and synthesize 5 states' leadership evaluation models
- Handout with instructions: What is the Big Picture of Evaluation in these states?
 - o Colorado: Kim Baker, Patrick Garcia, Jay Blain
 - o Rhode Island: Ann Anderson, Steve Laing, Morgan Murdock, Barry Graff
 - Ohio: Vicci Gappmayer, Lee Gagon, Richard Holmes
 - Delaware: Steve Dimond, Sol Garcia, Andrea Rorror
 - lowa: Jane Bitton, Brian Dawes, Scott Bushnell

The following evaluation components were reported on after the teams researched what their assigned state had included in their leader evaluation system.

Standards-based performance measures or Components for high quality instructional leadership

Rubrics and Evidence Examples (Artifacts, etc.)

Annual Timeline

Evaluation Cycle and Steps in Evaluation Process

Evaluator and Evaluatee Responsibilities

Professional Growth (Formative Processes) and Goal Setting

Self – assessment tools

Rating levels

Weighting of multiple measures within the evaluation system framework

Forms and Tracking Information

Other (such as Career Continuum, Differentiated evaluations for different administrator roles, etc.)

LUNCH (12:00)

6. Continue Team Work

Kerrie (12:30)

7. Whole Group Sharing

Suzanne (1:45)

• Each team will have 10 minutes to describe the BIG PICTURE of their state's evaluation model. Only clarification questions may be asked.

Kerrie and Suzanne took notes on newsprint while the groups reported out. This information will be used at the Jan. 26 meeting when the teams create Utah's leader evaluation system.

8. January 26 ACTIVITY

Kerrie (2:45)

Teams work in <u>collaborative groups</u> to develop the ideal model for Utah and make recommendations for our model

- Standards-based Performance and Evidence Examples (Rubric, Observation Tools, etc.)
- Annual Timeline, Cycle, Steps in Evaluation Process, Tracking Form, Evaluator and Evaluatee Responsibilities,
 Due Process, Administrator Roles, Career Continuum, etc.
- Professional Growth and Goal-setting, Formative Process, Self-Assessment, Rating Levels, Weighting Options, Summative Process, etc.
- Definition of Effectiveness, Purpose for Evaluation of Educational Leaders, Validity and Reliability, Pilot Recommendations and Timeline, etc.

Suzanne and Kerrie asked that everyone be present for the Jan. 26th meeting so that we have robust conversation about the ideas presented from the three work teams. Members that were not present for today's discussion are asked to attend so that everyone's perspectives are included.

10. Next Meeting: January 26: Utah Law and Justice Center, 9-3:00 Other Meeting Times:

- Feb. 9: JSD, ASB, 9-3:00 Final Recommendations and Formatting for Utah's Leadership Evaluation Model and Organizing Focus Groups for Feb. 23rd
- Feb. 23: JSD, ASB, 9-3:00 -- Focus Groups and Revisions based on feedback
- March 13: North and South Board Rooms, USOE, 9-3:00 -- Wrap-up Items
- April 24: Evaluation Summit, Site TBA